

sion or palpable absurdity. Suppose the waters of both these rivers are excluded, as flowing *neither way*, still the waters that flow *each way* are so far separated as to leave a tract of country which, if equally divided, would carry us far beyond the St. Johns. But we admit no such hypothesis. The *Atlantic* and the *sea* are used in the charters as synonymous terms. The Ristigouche, uniting with the Bay de Chaleurs, which communicates with the sea, and the St. Johns, uniting with the Bay of Fundy, which also communicates with the sea, and that too by a mouth 90 miles wide, are both Atlantic rivers. These rivers were known by the negotiators not to be St. Lawrence rivers—they were known to exist, for they were rivers of the first class. If they were neither St. Lawrence nor Atlantic, why were they not excepted? They were not of the former, therefore they must be included in the latter description. Indeed, if rivers uniting with Atlantic Bays are not Atlantic rivers, the Penobscot and Kennebec, which unite with the respective Bays of Penobscot and Sagadahock, would not be Atlantic rivers; and then where are those highlands which divide the waters referred to in the Treaty of 1783?—Should we leave this question unsettled a little longer, and the British claims continue to increase, we might very soon find these highlands south of the Connecticut, and all the intermediate country would be *recolonized* by “construction.” We therefore invoke the sympathy of all New England with New York besides, to unite against this progressive claim—this avalanche, which threatens to overwhelm them as well as ourselves.

Again, if this Mars Hill (and we confess we cannot speak of the pretension with any patience) is the N. W. Angle, and the north boundary of Nova Scotia and the south boundary of the Province of Quebec are the same, and north of the Bay de Chaleurs, then there is indeed *no* N. W. Angle; for a line, due north from the monument, passing by Mars Hill, must pursue nearly the same direction to get to the north of that Bay without crossing it; and whoever thought of an angle at the side of a continuous line? Now, according to the British maps, taken in this very case, you must run a course of north about 14 degs. east to obtain the north side of the Bay without crossing it, and the distance would be, in this almost due north direction, more than 100 miles—while that from the monument to Mars Hill would be little more than 40. Now when we consider that this northerly line must form nearly a right angle, to pass along the north shore of the Bay de Chaleurs, that is 100 miles farther north than Mars Hill, where, instead of an angle, there can be only an inclination of 14 degs., can there be a greater absurdity than the British claim, founded on these facts?

We will now present some facts and remarks in regard to the surveys and explorings made by the commission under the 5th article of the Treaty of Ghent. And the first fact that occurs is, that the elevations taken by the British surveyor, stop far short of where the